

pls  
do not  
enter the  
paper  
try  
3-29-04

### REMARKS

This paper is being filed in response to the final Office Action mailed November 12, 2003. Claims 1-7 were amended in a previously filed amendment and are pending.

The Examiner has rejected applicant's claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the published Aoyagi et al. U.S. Patent Application (Pub. No. 2001/0012112). According to the Examiner, applicant's previously filed amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection. The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant's independent claims 1 and 5 each recite a data processing apparatus for effecting a predetermined process with respect to another data processing apparatus. Claim 1 further recites a decision unit for deciding which data processing apparatus is to effect a charge process and a control unit for controlling the data processing apparatus decided by the decision unit to effect the charge process for both data processing apparatuses. Claim 5 further recites an information portion for informing the other data processing apparatus of information whether the data processing apparatus effects a charge process or not, so that the other data processing apparatus decides which data processing apparatus is to effect the charge process, and one of the data processing apparatuses effects the charge process for both data processing apparatuses. Applicant's independent claims 6 and 7 each recite a method for controlling a data processing apparatus according to claims 1 and 5, respectively.

The above constructions of independent claims 1, 5, 6 and 7 prevent performing duplicate charge process operations, i.e., process operations for determining a charge or cost, in a plurality of devices, as described in applicant's specification, for example, at page 11, line 15-page 12, line 11 and as shown in Figures 3 and 4. Such constructions are not taught or suggested by the cited art of record.